Harry R. Blackburn

Associates, P.C.

Attorneys at Law

June 21, 2006

John E. Hilser*‡

Of Counsel Federico Calaf-LeGrand~

> *Also Admitted in NJ ‡Also Admitted in FL

> > Ext. 105

~Admitted Only in PR Direct Dial

email: jhilser@hrblackburn.com

Honorable Joseph J. Farnan, Jr. United District Court for the District of Delaware Lockbox 18 844 N. King Street Wilmington, DE 19801

RLI Insurance Company v. Indian River School District, et al.

United District Court for the District of Delaware

Civil Action No. 1:05-cv-00858-JJF

Our File No. 729.004

Dear Judge Farnan:

This firm represents Plaintiff RLI Insurance Company in connection with the abovereferenced matter wherein Motions for Dismissal have bene filed by the Defendants and are currently pending before Your Honor. This office is in receipt of a June 12, 2006 letter from counsel for Defendants enclosing a recent case of Millsboro Fire Company v. Construction Management Services, Inc., a copy of which I enclose for Your Honor's reference. While counsel for Defendants is correct in quoting the opinion of the Court as holding "the provision of plans and design drawings used to construct the project do not constitute the business of supplying information," that decision fails to address specifically the negligent inspection and approval of payment applications of the contractor. On this point it is of paramount significance that a design professional or a contract manager need not undertake inspection and approval responsibilities on behalf of an owner. Indeed, such services are more aptly characterized as consulting services and are separate and distinct from an architect's preparation of plans and specifications, and a construction manager's activities. Accordingly, these consulting activities are for the specific purpose of providing information, and are not incidental and/or necessary to the architect's traditional function. As set forth in RLI Insurance Company's Memorandum of Law, any party reviewing and approving payment applications in connection with a construction project understands that these applications are not only relied upon by the owner in relation to contract balances but also the Surety and any lending institution involved in a project. Such information is utilized by these parties for purposes of making decisions to act upon and/or protect security interests in the ongoing construction. Thus, the Millsboro Fire Company case

Harry R. Blackburn
Associates, P.C.
Honorable Joseph J. Farnan, Jr.
June 21, 2006
Page 2

does not squarely address the inspection and approval functions undertaken by the architect and the construction management company in the present case. To be clear, the Surety's complaint in the instant action is addressed to these separate and distinct consulting services and not on "the provision of plans and design drawings used to construction the project."

Your Honor's consideration of the above is greatly appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ John E. Hilser JOHN E. HILSER

JEH/erl Enclosure

cc: Via First Class Mail, w/o encl:

Paul Cottrell, Esquire Donald L. Logan, Esquire Perry F. Goldlust, Esquire Kevin Amadio, Esquire James S. Green, Esquire Perry F. Goldlust (DSB #770) Aber Goldlust Baker & Over 702 King Street, Suite 600

702 King Street, Suite 600 P. O. Box 1675

Wilmington, DE 19899-1675 pgoldlust@gablawde.com

/s/ Perry F. Goldlust

(302) 472-4900

Q:\RLI Surety.729\McDaniel.004\Indian River\Ltr\Farnan, J 06-20-06.wpd